the United States Small Business Administration [SBA] with their 1995 award of SBA Georgia Veteran Advocate of the Year.

This SBA award recognizes Dr. Mescon's 12 years of volunteer contributions as a mentor, teacher and supporter of the Georgia Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program Small Business Training initiative. In his position as Dean of the Georgia State University School of Business, Dr. Mescon provided the Georgia Veterans Leadership Program with facilities, administrative support and access to the Georgia State University Small Business Development Center. He also gave his own time as a lecturer at seminars and special functions. These contributions, along with Dr. Mescon's perseverance and leadership, helped the fledgling program gain the necessary attention, support and credibility to successfully launch it's training initiative.

This Small Business Training initiative, begun in Georgia in 1983, has now been replicated across the nation. The Georgia Veterans Leadership Program has conducted seminars in 16 cities across the state of Georgia as well as in a dozen other states, reaching more than 10,000 veterans. The Georgia Veterans Leadership Program Small Business Training initiative has generated over 650 Small Business Administration-Veterans direct and guaranteed loans—for a total of nearly $400 million in loans.

Helping Dr. Mescon in his important work over the past 12 years has been a dedicated team of volunteers including Mr. Ron Miller, Mr. Tommy Clack, Mr. Rodney Alsup, Mr. Max Carey, Mr. Tom Carter, Mr. Ted Chernak, Mr. Andrew Farris, Mr. Dixon Jones, Ms. Mary Lou Keener, Mr. John Howe, Mr. Jim Mathis, Mr. Michael Mantegna, Mr. John Medlin, Mr. Steve Raines, Mr. Chuck Reaves, Mr. Richard Schuman and Mr. Dan Wall and the Honorable Max Cleland.

Mr. President I applaud the dedicated work of these Georgians and the many others who have helped with this initiative over the years. I congratulate Dr. Mescon for his receipt of the 1995 SBA Georgia Veteran Advocate of the Year and hope he will continue in his tireless work in support of Georgia's veterans.●

FRANK AUCOIN: SOUTH CAROLINA'S SMALL BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Frank AuCoin, South Carolina's small-business person of the year for 1995. He is owner and president of Sign It Quick, a computerized sign-making company based in Charleston.

Success has not simply knocked on the door for Frank. He has done it the old fashion way—by working hard. He is a self-made businessman whose sign-making chain now boasts nine franchises in South Carolina, Florida, and Tennessee. The chain generated nearly $4 million in sales just last year.

While Frank and his wife, Teresa, were operating a chain of bookstores in South Carolina and Georgia in the early 1970's, they realized the potential of the sign-making business when they could not get their signs made quickly enough. So they started making their own. By the late 1980's when the technology became available to generate computer-aided signs, Frank realized that he could start a business to create and mass-produce signs easily. In 1987, Frank and his wife invested their life savings into the concept of a computer-generated sign-making company and Sign It Quick was born.

Mr. President, I am delighted to commend Frank AuCoin's many successes as a small businessman. When he opened his first store he created the world's largest sign—one that was the length of five football fields. Since then, he has created signs for two Super Bowls, the Hard Rock Cafe chain, Euro-Disney, and Donald Trump.

Recently, the Post and Courier in my hometown of Charleston, reported that Frank was South Carolina's small-business person of the year. Now he is competing for the national honor from the U.S. Small Business Administration this month. I hope he wins.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Post and Courier, Mar. 18, 1995]

SIGN IT QUICK OWNER IS 1995 SBA HONOREE

Frank AuCoin, owner and president of Charleston-based Sign It Quick, has been named South Carolina's small-business person of the year for 1995.

The honor was announced Friday by its sponsor, the U.S. Small Business Administration.

''I'm really happy for the city of Charleston because this is the first time a company from here was ever in the running for this,'' AuCoin said.

Sign It Quick is a computerized sign-making company that operates nine franchises in South Carolina, Florida and Tennessee. The company, formed in 1987, is headquartered at 5101 Dorchester Road in Charleston Heights.

Sign It Quick has 60 employees. Company-wide sales were $3.7 million last year. Coincidentally, South Carolina's small-business person of the year for 1994 was a Sign It Quick franchise owner, Julie Wetherell of Columbia.

The SBA will recognize its top small-business honorees next month in Washington, D.C. Companies represent each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands/Puerto Rico. The national small-business person of 1995 will be picked from the 53 business owners.

Also, AuCoin will be honored at a luncheon in Columbia May 4.

SBA bases its selections on factors such as innovations, staying power, employee growth and sales increases.●

DEFENSE EXPORT LOAN GUARANTEE AMENDMENT TO S. 570

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues as a cosponsor of this amendment to S. 570, to create a defense export loan guarantee program. I believe the loan guarantee program will be critical to preserving our defense industrial base and is, therefore, an investment in America's long-term security.

In the post-cold war period, the United States has rightly reduced its procurement of expensive weapons systems. This has resulted in cost savings to the U.S. Treasury, but it has undermined the financial security of many of the manufacturers. We have encouraged conversion of some of the defense industry into production of other products. However, in the long run, we cannot afford to have all defense manufacturers convert to nondefense production. Even if the world's current trouble spots do not erupt into conflict, prompting another round of rearmament, the U.S. military must maintain an up-to-date inventory of the world's most capable equipment. To do that, we must preserve a minimum threshold of defense production, lest we face either astronomical startup costs or the disappearance of one or more critical defense producers altogether. Current U.S. defense procurement is not sufficient to keep some of these industries going; we must help them in their own efforts to export abroad.

I commend the administration for its recent review of arms export policy. That review concluded with the President's decision to preserve the current policy to discourage arms proliferation but to take into account as well U.S. domestic economic considerations in reaching a decision on applications for arms export licenses. I do not propose to change that policy in any respect.

While we do not want to make arms export licenses any more freely available than they are under current policy, I believe we should do more to level the playing field for U.S. manufacturers once an export license has been approved. U.S. defense industries face extremely tough competition for arms exports in the current international environment. Not only the United States, but also most of Western Europe have cut defense spending and military procurement budgets. In this shrinking market, U.S. defense manufacturers must compete against European and Canadian manufacturers who benefit from the extensive support—in some cases, including subsidies—of their governments.

Buyers have the advantage in the current, competitive international arms market. Having the best product, track record and support network is often not enough to win a competition. In many cases, one must also provide financing for the sale. At present, the only source of financing for U.S. weapons systems exports are commercial banks, whose loan rates often make the price for U.S. weapons exports uncompetitive. French, German, British, Italian and Canadian defense manufacturers can get government-subsidized or guaranteed loans for weapons exports. These governments are prepared to pay

a high price to preserve their defense industries and keep jobs at home.

In my own State of Connecticut, Norden, a corporation which produces advanced electronic systems for military vehicles, was forced to move some of its production to Canada in order to qualify for the Canadian export loan program essential to Norden's winning a contract for an export sale. Seventy-two Norden workers in Connecticut lost their jobs, good, skilled jobs, as a result. And they are not alone; defense industry workers in Rhode Island, Colorado and elsewhere have had their jobs exported for similar reasons.

In the current tight budgetary environment, we cannot afford a new subsidy for the defense industry, but neither can we afford to export highly-skilled, good-paying jobs abroad in order to keep our defense industries alive. This draft legislation fits within those constraints. In many ways, it could serve as a model for the 104th Congress. It is not foreign aid and does not require appropriated funds, yet it leverages the credit of the United States to help a sector of America's manufacturing and high-technology industry compete in the world market. This program is entirely self-financing; exporters and buyers together would provide money to cover the exposure fees and administrative costs associated with each loan. Furthermore, this program could not be used by poor countries to purchase arms they can ill afford; it would only be available to NATO allies, Central European countries moving toward democracy and members of the organization for Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation. Although limited in scope and requiring financial contributions from participating corporations, this program would be significant for U.S. defense manufacturers. A similar program operated by the State of California since 1985 has produced a steadily growing business in exports of defense equipment to Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand at a consistent 1-percent default rate. By supporting economic competitiveness at very modest cost to the U.S. Treasury, this program could be a model for the 104th Congress.

Although I am persuaded that this program will make a significant contribution to U.S. defense manufacturers' competitiveness, I would like to see proof. That is why we have included in the legislation the requirement for a report from the administration on the program's impact after 2 years. It if does not prove to be constructive contribution to the viability of the defense industry that I expect it to be, it should be ended. However, I expect the administration will report that this program has made a big difference in keeping these industries in production and keeping good jobs at home. I invite my colleagues to join us in working for adoption of this legislation.●

URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, following the approval of the Uruguay Round implementing legislation, statements have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD providing individual interpretations of the antidumping and countervailing duty provisions contained in title II of that Act. As one who was also deeply involved in the development and passage of that legislation, I, of course, respect the right to make those statements, but I would like to offer some further clarification.

Initially, it is important to emphasize that it is the statutory language that Congress enacted which must guide the implementation and interpretation of this legislation by the International Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce and their reviewing courts. To the extent that the statutory language is considered ambiguous, it is the Statement of Administrative Action, as well as the Senate and House committee reports—not the statements of individual Senators—which provide the primary sources of interpretation of H.R. 5110.

Given the representations that have been made, I also believe that it is important to provide the following clarification with respect to specific aspects of the antidumping and countervailing duty provisions contained in the Uruguay Round Agreements Act H.R. 5110.

International Trade Commission's determination of injury and threat. Several statements have addressed the Commission's implementation of H.R. 5110: Captive Production. I am the author of the Senate provision dealing with situations in which a captive production consideration should be used. Section 222 of H.R. 5110 was adopted to make clear to the Commission that, in certain captive production situations, it should consider primarily the data relating to competition in the merchant market, rather than data for the industry as a whole. Despite this language and clearly expressed legislative intent, it has been suggested that the Commission should continue to base its conclusions on an analysis of the industry as a whole, rather than of the merchant market. This suggestion is clearly contrary to the explicit language of section 222, as well as the intent expressed in the Statement of Administrative Action and the House and Senate committee reports.

Statements have also been made indicating that the Commission should apply the same criteria used in evaluating the domestic like product to evaluate whether it is appropriate to focus on noncaptive imports. These statements are also inconsistent with the plain language of section 222, which contains no restriction or direction as to how the Commission should analyze imports, whether captive or not. While there may be circumstances under which captive imports should be analyzed in a similar manner as captive domestic production, this should only be done after the Commission determines that captive imports do not compete with the relevant domestic like product—as was made explicitly clear in the implementing legislation that I authored.

Negligible Imports. It also has been suggested that the Commission must terminate an investigation unless import levels are found to be very close to the statutory negligibility threshold at the time of the preliminary determination and above that threshold at the time of the final determination. This suggestion is contrary to the unambiguous statutory language, which provides that the Commission may treat such imports as non-negligible in the threat context whenever it determines that there is a potential for such imports to increase to non-negligible levels. Thus, the Commission is under no obligation, and indeed would be acting contrary to the statute, to automatically terminate an investigation merely because imports are below the statutory negligibility threshold at the time of either the preliminary or final investigations. This is particularly true given that, as the Commission's practice and section 222 recognize, the filing of a petition may itself have a dampening effect on import levels. As a result, it is expected that the Commission will consider the negligibility provision carefully and that it will only find imports to be negligible in the context of threat where there is no potential for an imminent increase in imports.

ANTICIRCUMVENTION

Statements have been made suggesting that section 230 of H.R. 5110 should be interpreted to limit Commerce's ability to apply the anticircumvention provisions and that, before Commerce enlarges the scope of an order, the Commission may be required to make an additional injury finding regarding that enlarged scope.

These statements, however, are contrary to the statute and the Statement of Administrative Action. As explained in the Statement of Administrative Action, this amendment was adopted because the former statute failed to provide a full or adequate remedy for the circumvention occurring in the marketplace. As a result, section 230 clearly provides Commerce with broad discretion in its application of the anticircumvention provisions, so that it can address the different types of circumvention encountered. Further, neither the statute nor the Statement of Administration Action require the Commission to issue a new injury determination before Commerce enlarges the scope of an order, although the two agencies will engage in consultations before Commerce makes its final determination.

SUNSET REVIEWS

Several statements have been made with respect to different aspects of Commerce's and the Commission's application of the new sunset provisions,